

## ***..to save the life of the mother?***

**Q: On what Biblical basis is abortion 'acceptable' to save the life of the mother?**

**A: There is no biblical justification to willfully destroy a pre-born life in the hopes that it might give the mother a greater opportunity of life**

(Note: The above argument presumes that an abortion is needed or the mother's life would be lost. There is no Biblical justification for this argument)

---

**The following medical references show this not to be a valid argument since mother and child are separate patients and can be treated separately**

"Protection of the life of the mother as an excuse for an abortion is a smoke screen. In my 36 years of pediatric surgery I have never known of one instance where the child had to be aborted to save the mother's life. If toward the end of the pregnancy complications arise that threaten the mother's health, the doctor will either induce labor or perform a Caesarian section. His intention is to save the life of both the mother and the baby. The baby's life is never willfully destroyed because the mother's life is in danger."

- C. Everett Koop, M.D. Former U.S. Surgeon-General

"There is never a reason in law or in practice to advocate a "life of the mother" exception for abortion. We base this statement on testimony of many pro-life physicians over the years, including John F. Hillabrand, M.D., Herbert Ratner, M.D., and Bernard N. Nathanson, M.D." <http://www.abortiontv.com/LifeOfMotherException.htm>

"Medical advances have drastically reduced the numbers of such tragic cases. Further, in unborn children less than 21-weeks, the death of the mother necessarily means the death of the child as well, so an either/or decision should not arise. The choice is to simply save the life of the mother, or allow both to die.

In cases that fit the category of either/or, the death of the child should never be the objective of medicine. The objective should be to save the mother's and child's lives. If the mother cannot be saved unless there is dire consequence to the child, then no one can call this "abortion". Such cases should not be called "abortion", because it is clear the mother had intent to carry her child to term. To call them such is demeaning and insensitive" [www.americasvoices.org/avarc2001/archives2001/WallaceM/WallaceM\\_061801-3.htm](http://www.americasvoices.org/avarc2001/archives2001/WallaceM/WallaceM_061801-3.htm)

Relative to ectopic pregnancies: "...the removal of the diseased organ is morally permissible, although the death of the fetus ensues, because the operation is directed, not against the fetus but against the pathological condition of the mother. It is not the case of attaining a good effect by means of the bad, because the mother's life is saved, not by the death of the fetus, but by the removal of the pathological condition." Gerald Kelly (Medical-Moral Problems, pp. 112f.)

"Today it is possible for almost any patient to be brought through pregnancy alive, unless she suffers from a fatal disease such as cancer or leukemia, and if so, abortion would be unlikely to prolong, much less save the life of the mother."

—Alan Guttmacher, former Planned Parenthood president: "Abortion Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow," The Case for Legalized Abortion Now, Berkeley, CA: Diablo Books, 1967, p. 9.

"It is important to distinguish between direct abortion, which is the intentional and willed destruction of a preborn child, and a legitimate treatment a pregnant mother may choose to save her life. Operations that are performed to save the life of the mother—such as the removal of a cancerous uterus or an ectopic pregnancy that poses the threat of imminent death—are considered indirect abortions. <http://www.all.org/issues/abhow02.htm>

The "principle of double effect." Under this principle, the death of the child is an unintended effect of an operation independently justified by the necessity of saving the mother's life. [www.all.org/issues/abhow02.htm](http://www.all.org/issues/abhow02.htm)

"The classical example of an ectopic pregnancy or the example of the cancerous uterus, which allow the surgeon, ethically, to remove the woman's damaged reproductive organs in order to save her life, should not be used as examples of abortion, even though a baby's life is terminated in the process.

"It becomes necessary now to see why a medical procedure, such as the excision of a cancerous, pregnant uterus, is sometimes ethically permissible and should not be called an abortion." [www.ewtn.com/library/PROLIFE/EXCEPT.TXT](http://www.ewtn.com/library/PROLIFE/EXCEPT.TXT)

"Essentially, both mother and child should be treated as patients. A doctor should try to protect both. However, in the course of treating a woman, if her child dies, that is not considered abortion." <http://www.all.org/issues/abhow02.htm>



2004, Gateway Pregnancy Center